UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,084	07/13/2005	Weihong Zheng	104300-2	9772
	7590 04/17/200 AUGHLIN & MARC	EXAMINER		
875 THIRD AV	/E	ALI, FARHAD		
18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2109	
		·		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	-	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/542,084	ZHENG ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
	·	Farhad Ali	2109	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under a since the since the practice under a since the practice under a since the since the since the since the since th	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>2 and 3</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2005 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	accepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/542,084 Page 2

Art Unit: 2109

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zadesky et al. (US 7,046,230 B2) in view of Lin (US 2006/0075151 A1), and further in view of Wright et al. (US 7,103,381 B1).
- 3. With regard to claim 1 Zadesky et al. discloses a media player comprising of a microprocessor, ROM memory, and an amplifier (Column 5 Line 32-36). Zadesky also discloses a USB interface (Column 8 Line 42-44), a headphone jack for audio output (Column 8 Line 31-34), and a LCD display (Column 5 Line 50).

Zadesky does not disclose flash memory or a switch integrated circuit for collinear transmission of USB/Audio output.

Lin et al. discloses an audio player that can utilize flash memory (Paragraph 27) as a primary storage device.

Wright et al. discloses a switching circuit where a USB signal and audio signal are implemented over a shared conductor (Column 3 Line 31-39).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the media player disclosed by Zadesky to utilize flash memory and a switch integrated circuit for collinear transmission of USB/Audio output. It is prima facie Application/Control Number: 10/542,084 Page 3

Art Unit: 2109

obvious to combine the inventions, as flash memory is a commonly known alternative for storing data, and a switch integrated circuit for collinear transmission of USB/audio output would provide a added convenience to the consumer of having a single interface to interact with, as well as improving the overall visual appeal of the media player itself by reducing visible connectors.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claim 2 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. Claim 3 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

 F.A. 4/u/2007

Allm hu